

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-44 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants amend the specification and Claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 18, 19, 21, 28, 29, 31, 38, 39, and 41-44.

The drawings were objected to for containing various informalities. Applicants have amended Claims 9, 19, 29, and 39 so as to refer to "an obstacle" instead of "a dispersing device." An obstacle 65 is disclosed, for example, in the third full paragraph on page 18 of the originally filed specification and shown in Fig. 20 of the originally filed drawings. In addition, Applicants have amended the specification so as to mention reference signs R and 93. With respect to reference signs "A" and "M," contrary to the Examiner's allegations, these reference signs are mentioned in the originally filed specification. Particularly, reference sign "A" is mentioned, for example, in the second full paragraph of page 8 of the originally filed specification, and reference sign "M" is mentioned in the fifth full paragraph of page 18 of the originally filed specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

Claims 6, 7, 8, 11, 18, 21, 28, 36, 38, 42, and 44 were objected to for containing minor informalities. With respect to Claims 6 and 7, the Examiner alleged that "the main surface" lacks proper antecedent basis. This is clearly incorrect. Each of Claims 6 and 7 are dependent upon Claim 4, which recites "a main surface" on lines 2 and 3 thereof. The claims have been amended to correct the remaining minor informalities noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

Claims 9 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite. Applicants have amended Claims 9 and 19 to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-11, 13, 14, 16-21, 23, 24, 26-31, 33, 34, 36-40, 43, and 44 were

rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kiyokawa et al. (U.S. 6,019,564). Claims 5, 15, 25, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiyokawa et al. Claims 2, 12, 22, 32, 41, and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiyokawa et al. in view of Saito et al. (JP 63-295323). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of Claims 1-44.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

A handling device for electronic chip components, comprising:
an accommodating device having a plurality of cavities
arranged to put electronic chip components thereinto; and
a feeder arranged to supply the electronic chip components
to the accommodating device; wherein

the feeder includes a transport surface arranged to transport the electronic chip components towards the plurality of cavities, and a feeding section arranged to feed the electronic components into the plurality of cavities;

the accommodating device is arranged to move such that at least two of the plurality of cavities are simultaneously disposed at a location in close proximity to the feeding section of the feeder, and **the electronic chip components are put directly into the cavities from the feeding section of the feeder by providing suction in the cavities from a cavity side.** (emphasis added)

Applicants' Claims 11, 21, 31, and 41-44 recite features that are similar to the features recited in Applicants' Claim 1, including the above-emphasized features.

With the unique combination and arrangement of features recited in Applicants' Claims 1, 11, 21, 31, and 41-44, including the features of "the feeder includes a transport surface arranged to transport the electronic chip components towards the plurality of cavities, and a feeding section arranged to feed the electronic components into the plurality of cavities" and "the electronic chip components are put directly into the cavities from the feeding section of the feeder by providing suction in the cavities from a cavity side," Applicants have been able to provide a handling device for electronic chip components and a handling method for electronic chip components in which electrical characteristics of the electronic chip components can be quickly measured and damage

to the electronic components is prevented (see, for example, the second full paragraph on page 2 of the originally filed specification).

The Examiner alleged that Kiyokawa et al. teaches all of the features recited in Applicants' Claims 1, 11, 21, 31, 43, and 44, and that the combination of Kiyokawa et al. and Saito et al. teaches all of the features recited in Applicants' Claims 41 and 42.

Applicants' Claim 1 has been amended to recite the features of "the feeder includes a transport surface arranged to transport the electronic chip components towards the plurality of cavities, and a feeding section arranged to feed the electronic components into the plurality of cavities" and "the electronic chip components are put directly into the cavities from the feeding section of the feeder by providing suction in the cavities from a cavity side." Applicants' Claims 11, 21, 31, and 41-44 have been similarly amended. Support for these features is found, for example, in the first full paragraph through the third full paragraph on page 8 of the originally filed specification.

In contrast to the Applicants' Claims 1, 11, 21, 31, and 41-44, Kiyokawa et al. teaches a handling device in which electronic components are picked up by pick-up heads 3F, 3R, which the Examiner alleged correspond to the feeder recited in Applicants' Claims 1, 11, 21, 31, and 41-44, using vacuum force provided to the pick-up heads 3F, 3R. The pick-up heads 3F, 3R are moved by carrier arms 10, 11, and the electronic components are transferred to a contact arm 6 via a transfer arm 8. The electronic components are then tested while being disposed on the contact arm 6 by a vacuum force, and finally, the electronic components are disposed in cavities 5 of an accommodating turntable 4.

Kiyokawa et al. fails to teach or suggest the feature of "the feeder includes a transport surface arranged to transport the electronic chip components towards the plurality of cavities, and a feeding section defined by an opening portion in the feeder arranged to feed the electronic components into the plurality of cavities" as recited in Applicants' Claim 1, and similarly in Applicants' Claims 11, 21, 31, and 41-44.

In addition, the electronic components of Kiyokawa et al. are fed from the feeder 3F, 3R, to the transfer arm 8, from the transfer arm 8 to the contact arm 6, and finally, from the contact arm 6 to the cavities 5. In other words, the electronic components are fed from the feeder 3F, 3R to the cavities 5 via two intermediate structural elements, i.e., the transfer arm 8 and the contact arm 6. Furthermore, Kiyokawa et al. fails to teach or suggest any suction force that is provided in the cavities 5. In contrast, Kiyokawa et al. teaches that the contact arm 6 has a vacuum force applied thereto to enable the electronic components to be held by the contact arm 6. When the electronic components of Kiyokawa et al. are moved adjacent to the cavities 5, the vacuum force applied to the contact arm 6 is discontinued so as to allow the electronic components to drop from the contact arm 6 and into the cavities 5. Thus, Kiyokawa et al. certainly fails to teach or suggest the feature of “the electronic chip components are put directly into the cavities from the feeding section of the feeder by providing suction in the cavities from a cavity side” as recited in Applicants’ Claim 1, and similarly in Applicants’ Claims 11, 21, 31, and 41-44.

The Examiner relied upon Saito et al. to alleged cure deficiencies of Kiyokawa et al. However, Saito et al. fails to teach or suggest the features of “the feeder includes a transport surface arranged to transport the electronic chip components towards the plurality of cavities, and a feeding section arranged to feed the electronic components into the plurality of cavities” and “the electronic chip components are put directly into the cavities from the feeding section of the feeder by providing suction in the cavities from a cavity side” as recited in Applicants’ Claim 1, and similarly in Applicants’ Claims 11, 21, 31, and 41-44.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1, 11, 21, 31, 43, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kiyokawa et al., and the rejection of Claims 41 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiyokawa et al. in view of Saito et al.

Application No. 10/809,679
February 1, 2007
Reply to the Office Action dated September 5, 2006
Page 19 of 19

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 11, 21, 31, and 41-44 are allowable. Claims 2-10, 12-20, 22-30, and 32-40 depend upon Claims 1, 11, 21, and 31, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that Claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition the Commissioner for a Two-Month Extension of Time, extending to February 5, 2007, the period for response to the Office Action dated September 5, 2006.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 1, 2007

/Christopher A. Bennett #46,710/
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 850
Tyson's Corner, VA 22102
Telephone: (703) 637-1480
Facsimile: (703) 637-1499

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710